

Remarks

Claims 1 – 30 are pending. Claims 1 – 30 presently stand rejected. Claims 1 – 6, 8, 10, 13 – 15, 18 – 21, 23, and 26 – 28 have been amended. Examination in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1 – 5, 9, 10, 11, 18 – 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,224,055 (Walker).

Independent claims 1 and 18 have been amended.

Claims 1 and 18, as now amended, are directed to an instant lottery game system that includes a defining element that carries a symbol display zone and a symbol interpretation zone. The symbol display zone contains a plurality of symbols providing the outcome of a spinning reel game. Prior to game play, a masking medium covers the symbol display zone. During game play, the masking medium is removed to reveal the game outcome. The symbol interpretation zone contains indicia used to interpret the symbols of the spinning reel game outcome revealed in the unmasked symbol display zone, and thus the symbol interpretation zone determines the prize for the spinning reel game outcome.

Claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Walker.

The Examiner indicates on page 4 of the Action that “Walker does not contain a plurality of symbols representative of a spinning reel game outcome.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Walker also does not disclose a symbol interpretation zone that contains an indicia used to interpret the symbols of a spinning reel game outcome revealed in the unmasked symbol display zone and thus the symbol interpretation zone determines the prize for the spinning reel game outcome.

Rather, Walker discloses an initial configuration 110c that displays an initial hand of cards. The interpretation of that initial configuration 110c is not changed by another zone.

Instead, a new set of cards replaces the first set of cards. This new set of cards is selected by the player picking one of a plurality of strategies in a strategy section 120. Thus, Walker discloses the use of another plurality of cards (after the cards displayed in the initial configuration 110c) based on a strategy selection by the player.

Thus, the “zone 130” interpreted by the Examiner to be the claimed symbol interpretation zone does not have indicia used to interpret.

Therefore, Walker fails to disclose a symbol interpretation zone that contains an indicia used to interpret the symbols of a spinning reel game outcome revealed in a different display zone.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is also non-obvious for Walker to disclose a symbol interpretation zone that contains an indicia used to interpret the symbols of the spinning reel game outcome revealed in the unmasked symbol display zone.

Therefore, claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Walker, and are allowable.

Claims 2 – 5, 9, 10, 11, and claims 19 – 24 depend from claims 1 and 18, respectively, and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,237,913 (Kamille).

Kamille fails to cure the deficiencies of Walker.

Kamille fails to disclose a symbol interpretation zone that contains an indicia used to interpret the symbols of the spinning reel game outcome revealed in the unmasked symbol display zone.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Walker and Kamille.

Claims 6 – 8, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 12, 13, 17, 25, 26, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,949,042 (Dietz).

Dietz fails to cure the deficiencies of Walker.

Dietz fails to disclose a symbol interpretation zone that contains an indicia used to interpret the symbols of the spinning reel game outcome revealed in the unmasked symbol display zone.

Therefore, claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Walker and Dietz.

Claims 12, 13, and 17 depend from claim 1, and claims 17, 25, 26, and 30 depend from claim 18, are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 18.

Claims 14, 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0042317 (Behm).

Behm fails to cure the deficiencies of Walker.

Behm fails to disclose a symbol interpretation zone that contains an indicia used to interpret the symbols of the spinning reel game outcome revealed in the unmasked symbol display zone.

Therefore, claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Walker and Behm.

Claim 14 and 27 depend from claims 1 and 18, respectively, and are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 18.

Claims 15, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker and Behm in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,934,671 (Harrison).

Harrison fails to cure the deficiencies of Walker and Behm.

Harrison fails to disclose a symbol interpretation zone that contains an indicia used to interpret the symbols of the spinning reel game outcome revealed in the unmasked symbol display zone.

Therefore, claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Walker, Behm, and Harrison.

Claim 15 and 28 depend from claims 1 and 18, respectively, and are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 18.

Claims 16, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker and Deitz and Kamille.

Kamille fails to cure the deficiencies of Walker and Deitz.

As discussed above, Kamille fails to disclose a symbol interpretation zone that contains an indicia used to interpret the symbols of the spinning reel game outcome revealed in the unmasked symbol display zone.

Therefore, claims 1 and 18 are patentable over Walker, Deitz, and Kamille.

Claim 16 and 29 depend from claims 1 and 18, respectively, and are also allowable for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 18.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of claims 1 –30 are allowable. In the event that the Examiner believes a telephone interview with the undersigned Applicants' Representative would be helpful in advancing prosecution of this patent application, the undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2011

/Larry M. Jarvis/

Larry M. Jarvis

Reg. No. 27,341

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street
34th Floor
Chicago, IL 60661
Phone (312) 775-8000
Fax (312) 775-8100